



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,290	07/16/2001	Reinhard Evers	WK-188	5951

24956 7590 02/21/2003

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PARSLEY, DAVID J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3643

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/807,290

Applicant(s)

EVERS ET AL.

Examiner

David J Parsley

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Detailed Action

Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment (paper no. 9) dated 12-2-02 and this action is non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in –

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,059,648 to Kodama et al.

Referring to claims 1 and 11, Kodama et al. discloses a device for removing the fillets from the eviscerated carcasses of poultry whose extremities have been detached, including at least one measuring device – see figures 10a-10b for measuring the individual dimensions of the carcass, at least one control unit – the control unit is inherent in that the device is electrically powered and automatically powered and driven, and at least one scraping device – at 71, wherein

Art Unit: 3643

the measuring device is connected via the control unit to the at least one scraping device – at 71 for the purpose of communicating, wherein the measuring device is designed for detection of body joint points, and a or each scraping device includes a disc-like scraping element – see for example figures 1-13b.

Referring to claim 2, Kodama et al. discloses two scraping device – at 71 are provided.

Referring to claim 3, Kodama et al. discloses the a or each scraping device comprises at least two disc-like scraping elements – at 71.

Referring to claim 4, Kodama et al. discloses the a or each scraping element – at 71 is of rotatable construction.

Referring to claim 5, Kodama et al. discloses at least one scraping device includes an element for pulling back the tender sinew – see for example figures 14-15 and column 23.

Referring to claim 6, Kodama et al. discloses the disc-like scraping elements are of pivotable construction such that the circumferential surfaces of the discs are arranged so that they can be rolled over the wishbone from the body joint of the poultry carcass – see for example figures 13a-13b.

Referring to claim 7, Kodama et al. discloses in front of each scraping device in the direction of conveying is arranged at least one measuring device – see for example figures 1-2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3643

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,962,568 to Rudy et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,372,539 to Kunig et al. or GB Patent No. 2129278 to Meyn.

Referring to claim 1, Rudy et al. discloses a device for removing the fillets from the eviscerated carcasses of poultry whose extremities have been detached, including at least one measuring device – see column 4 for measuring the individual dimensions of the carcass, at least one control unit – at 96, and at least one scraping device – at 138-146, wherein the measuring device is connected via the control unit to the at least one scraping device for the purpose of communicating, wherein the measuring device is designed for detection of body joint points, and a or each scraping device includes a scraping element – see for example figures 1-7. Rudy et al. does not disclose the scraping element is disc shaped. Meyn and Kunig et al. do disclose the scraping device – 27 of Meyn and – 46,49 of Kunig et al., is constructed as a disc-like scraping element. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the fillet removing device of Rudy et al. and add the disc-like scraping elements of Meyn or Kunig et al., so as to make the scraping element more durable and longer lasting in that the entire outer surface of the disc-like scraping element comes into contact with the poultry carcass at intervals depending on the speed of rotation instead of only a small portion of the scraper element coming in contact with the carcass.

Referring to claim 2, Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. further discloses two scraping devices – 27 of Meyn; and – 46,49 of Kunig et al. are provided. Therefore it would

Art Unit: 3643

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Rudy et al. and add the two scraping devices of Meyn or Kunig et al., so as to allow for quicker and more accurate scraping of the meat from the bone of the carcass.

Referring to claim 3, Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. further discloses the or each scraping device comprises at least two disc-like scraping elements – 27 of Meyn and – 46,49 of Kunig et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the fillet removing device of Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. and further add the two disc-like scraping elements of Meyn or Kunig et al., so as to make the scraping element more durable and longer lasting in that the entire outer surface of the disc-like scraping element comes into contact with the poultry carcass at intervals depending on the speed of rotation instead of only a small portion of the scraper element coming in contact with the carcass.

Referring to claim 4, Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. further discloses the or each scraping element – 27 of Meyn – 46,49 of Kunig et al. is of rotatable construction. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the fillet removing device of Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. and further add the scraper elements being rotatable of Meyn or Kunig et al., so as to make the scraping element more durable and longer lasting in that the entire outer surface of the disc-like scraping element comes into contact with the poultry carcass at intervals depending on the speed of rotation instead of only a small portion of the scraper element coming in contact with the carcass.

Referring to claim 6, Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. further discloses the disc-like scraping elements are of pivotable construction such that the circumferential surfaces of their discs are arranged so that they can be rolled over the wishbone from the body

Art Unit: 3643

joint of the poultry carcass – see for example figures 1-4 of Meyn and figures 1-3 of Kunig et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the fillet removing device of Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. and further add the scraping elements rolling over the wishbone from the body joint of Meyn or Kunig et al., so as to ensure that the carcass is scraped over its entire surface running along the breast to ensure proper removal of the breast fillets.

Referring to claim 7, Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. further discloses that in front of each scraping device in the direction of conveying is arranged at least one measuring device – see for example figures 1-4 of Rudy et al.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,059,648 to Kodama or U.S. Patent No. 5,314,374 to Koch et al. Kodama and Koch et al. disclose at least one scraping device – 71 of Kodama et al. and – 28 of Koch et al. includes an element for pulling back the tender sinew – see for example figures 14-15 of Kodama and figure 4 of Koch et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Rudy et al. as modified by Meyn or Kunig et al. and add the scraping device including an element for pulling back the tender sinew of Kodama or Koch, so as to allow for tender sinew to be easily and accurately removed automatically by the device.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,021,024 to Villemin et al. in view of Meyn.

Referring to claim 11, Villemin et al. discloses a method for removing the fillets from the eviscerated carcasses of poultry whose extremities have been detached including the steps of

Art Unit: 3643

introducing into the device for removing fillets, detection of the individual carcass dimensions by recording carcass-specific data – see for example figure 3, control of the or each scraping device and mounting of scraping elements on previously determined body joint points – see for example figure 3, subsequent detachment of the fillets from the skeleton by the scraping elements, and final and complete detachment of the fillets by subsequent scraping tools – H and J – see for example figure 1. Villemin et al. does not disclose the scraping elements are disc-like. Meyn does disclose the scraping elements – 27 are disc-like – see for example figure 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method for removing fillets of Villemin et al. and add the disc-like scraping elements of Meyn, so as to make the scraping elements more durable and longer lasting in that the entire outer surface of the disc-like scraping element comes into contact with the poultry carcass at intervals depending on the speed of rotation instead of only a small portion of the scraper element coming in contact with the carcass.

Referring to claim 12, Villemin et al. as modified by Meyn further discloses the detection of the carcass dimensions is effected by mechanical sensing of the body joint points – see for example figure 3 and columns 4-5 of Villemin et al.

Referring to claim 13, Villemin et al. as modified by Meyn further discloses the two sides of the poultry carcass are processed one after the other – see for example figure 3 and columns 4-5 of Villemin et al.

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kodama as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Villemin.

Art Unit: 3643

Referring to claim 12, Villemin et al. discloses the detection of the carcass dimensions is effected by mechanical sensing of the body joint points – see for example figure 3 and columns 4-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method of Kodama and add the mechanical sensing of Villemin, so as to make the allow for direct contact of the carcass to determine the position and dimensions of the carcass thus making the measuring more accurate.

Referring to claim 13, Villemin et al. discloses the two sides of the poultry carcass are processed one after the other – see for example figure 3 and columns 4-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method of Kodama and add the two sides of the poultry carcass processed one after the other of Villemin et al., so as to effect accurate removal of the fillets from the carcass.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 11-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to poultry fillet processing devices in general:

U.S. Pat. No. 4,557,019 to Van Devanter et al. – shows fillet measuring means

U.S. Pat. No. 4,567,624 to van Mil – shows rotatable scraper

Art Unit: 3643

U.S. Pat. No. 4,648,156 to Meyn – shows multiple scraper elements

U.S. Pat. No. 4,688,297 to Bartels – shows multiple scraper and cutting elements

U.S. Pat. No. 5,697,837 to Verrijp et al. – shows scraper elements

U.S. Pat. No. 6,142,863 to Janssen et al. – shows scraper elements

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to David Parsley whose telephone number is (703) 306-0552. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon, can be reached at (703) 308-2574.



PETER M. POON
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

2/12/03